

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Serial Number: | 10/666495 | | |
| Application. Filed: | September 22, 2003 | | |
| Applicant: | Kia Silverbrook | | |
| Application Title: | Camera Control Print Medium | | |
| Examiner/GAU: | Albert H Cutler | 2622 | |
| | Dated | July 19, 2007 | |
| | At: | Balmain, NSW | |
| | Docket No. | BAL26US | |

REPLY

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, District of Columbia 20231

Dear Sir:

The Final Office Action has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that the issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 11 as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al (US Patent No. 5,477,264) in view of Hara et al. (US Patent No. 5,726,435).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that the claims are unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al in view of Hara et al.

In particular, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or motivation to modify the references.

Specifically, MPEP 2143.01 states:

“There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art.” In re Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998)

In this instance the Examiner appears to be solely relying on the Examiner's interpretation of the nature of the problem to be solved: *“providing a camera with control instructions”*. However, based on the nature of this problem, the Examiner has reached the conclusion that Hara et al. is clearly pertinent to solving such a problem. The Applicant rejects such reasoning.